

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

German De Jesus Ventura,	)	1:17-1199-PMD-SVH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	ORDER
United States of America, R.J.	)	
Stallings, Mrs. Rosario, Dr. Fonte,	)	
Mr. Finnerty, and Warden Bonita	)	
S. Mosely,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

German De Jesus Ventura (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action seeking compensatory damages pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971),<sup>1</sup> and the Federal Tort Claims Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1346(b) (“FTCA”). This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel. [ECF No. 39].

There is no right to appointed counsel in § 1983 cases. *Cf. Hardwick v. Ault*, 517 F.2d 295, 298 (5th Cir. 1975). While the court is granted the power to exercise its discretion to appoint counsel for an indigent in a civil action, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); *Smith v. Blackledge*, 451 F.2d 1201 (4th Cir. 1971), such

---


<sup>1</sup> *Bivens* established that victims of a constitutional violation perpetrated by a federal actor may sue the offender for damages in federal court despite the absence of explicit statutory authorization for such suits.

appointment “should be allowed only in exceptional cases.” *Cook v. Bounds*, 518 F.2d 779, 780 (4th Cir. 1975). Plaintiff in his motion has not shown that any exceptional circumstances exist in this case. Rather, he simply states that he has limited legal knowledge and that his detention in state custody will limit his ability to litigate this case.

After a review of the file, this court has determined that there are no exceptional or unusual circumstances presented that would justify the appointment of counsel, nor would Plaintiff be denied due process if an attorney were not appointed. *Whisenant v. Yuam*, 739 F.2d 160 (4th Cir. 1984). The court notes that Plaintiff has competently represented himself thus far. In most civil rights cases, the issues are not complex, and whenever such a case brought by an uncounseled litigant goes to trial, the court outlines proper procedure so the uncounseled litigant will not be deprived of a fair opportunity to present his case. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s request for a discretionary appointment of counsel under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(1) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 10, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges  
United States Magistrate Judge